

Goldwater's 'Cold Facts' Against Nuclear Test Ban Spur Rebuttal

I write this letter in disagreement with Barry Goldwater's recent column, "Cold Facts Against Test Ban." My first objection to Goldwater's view is that nowhere therein does he employ "cold facts." Instead he makes statements that are in no way proven or even convincing and presents them as "cold facts."

Goldwater says: "So long as this nation maintains a nuclear superiority it has a shield to oppose the aggression which continues to be a fundamental fact of Soviet life."

Firstly, the time has passed when merely keeping ahead—by any distance—constitutes a defense. Both the United States and Russia have reached a point where nuclear superiority is immaterial. Both nations have the capacity to destroy the world; a power superior to that is unnecessary.

Secondly, what exactly are these aggressions which are such a "fundamental fact of Soviet life?" How is the U.S.S.R. "aggressive, and proven so?" Even if one argues that Vietnam and Cuba are examples of Soviet aggression, American nuclear superiority is not, and should not be, involved there.

I object also to Goldwater's idea that only when the United States has the combative advantage will peace talks be possible. One must abandon the idea that we are the only nation capable of "settling differences rationally rather than violently."

Isn't it conceivable that some other nation, perhaps even one hostile to us, might be willing to put down the weapons and talk—even though the United States isn't forcing the terms by its overwhelming military strength? Waiting until the world has become peaceful—on our terms—to end nuclear testing is one of the most illogical, unrealistic, and pessimistic ideas to come yet from Goldwater.

There would be no end to an attempt to keep ahead of Russia in the arms race. Already the attempt is meaningless and senseless. Weapons—whether they're theirs or ours—are notoriously unsuccessful at achieving a real peace.

Perhaps a little of that illusive rationality might find some success. It is certainly worth as much effort as is needlessly put into the arms race.

SARA CUMMINS
Los Angeles

around the fact that the President of the United States is unaware of the activities of certain sensitive departments of the government. In the first place, the Chief Executive is responsible for all activities of the Executive Branch whether he is aware of the activities or not. Secondly, this gives a poor image of the power of the Presidency itself and is detrimental to the country.

KATHLEEN KNIGHT
Inglewood

FOIAb3b

CPYRGHT

CPYRGHT Pearson on CIA Affair

Regarding Drew Pearson's article (Feb. 21) "Kennedy, Johnson, CIA . . .":

As a student one learns to consider the motives of the author of any piece. On the face, Pearson's article appears to defend President Johnson's attitude on the CIA-NSA situation of recent weeks.